

REMARKS

Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-4, 9-17, and 20-22 will remain pending in this application. Claims 5-6 and 19 were previously cancelled. Claims 7-8 and 18 are cancelled in this amendment. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the present amendment. For example, the matter added to claims 1, 13, and 22 is supported in the Specification at least at paragraphs [0052], [0053], [0059], and [0061].

Claims 1, 13, and 22 stand objected to because of certain alleged informalities. Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0108271 (issued as U.S. Patent No. 7,206,789, “Hurmiz et al.”). Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-18, and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 (“Le”). Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,536 (“Pasumansky et al.”).

Claim Objections

Claims 1, 13, and 22 stand objected to because of certain alleged informalities. In particular, it is alleged that the first (persist metadata) and second (persist both metadata and object data changes) persistence models seem interchangeable at least until data is modified. It was suggested that Applicant amend the claim language to more clearly differentiate between these two persistence models.

Applicant has amended claims 1, 13, and 22 to more clearly differentiate between the persistence properties. In one persistence property in which only metadata is persisted, “metadata is copied from the source datastore to the target datastore and changes to metadata of the linked source object are not updated in the target datastore until object data of the linked source object is altered.” In another persistence property in which both metadata and object data changes of the linked source object are persisted, “the metadata and the object data are copied from the source datastore to the target datastore” (emphasis added).

In view of the above amendments, the difference between the first and second persistence properties is clear. In the first persistence property, only the metadata is copied

from the source datastore to the target datastore. In the second persistence property, both the metadata and the object data are copied from the source datastore to the target datastore. Because this distinction has been made clear, Applicant respectfully requests that the objection to claims 1, 13, and 22 be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, and 22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as allegedly being anticipated by Hurmiz et al. As to claims 1, 13, and 22, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Hurmiz et al. discloses a method, system, and computer readable storage medium of sharing database objects between a source datastore and a target datastore, including all of the limitations of claims 1, 13, and 22. In particular, paragraph [0026] is alleged to disclose the limitations relating to the various persistence properties recited in claims 1, 13, and 22.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Paragraph [0026] of Hurmiz et al. reads:

[0026] Data management system 107 is relational or object oriented (OO)/component based. Database management system 107 controls the storing, retrieving, and updating of data and metadata in database records 109(a)-109(n). Database management system 107 also controls data integration, enforces integrity rules and constraints (including data integrity and referential integrity), and enforces security constraints. An Open DataBase Connectivity (ODBC) or Java DataBase Connectivity (JDBC) protocol, or the like, can be provided for direct connection to database records 109(a)-109(n).

Accordingly, paragraph [0026] of Hurmiz et al. generally discloses that the database management system controls the storing, retrieving, and updating of data and metadata in the database records and also controls data integration, enforces integrity rules and constraints, and enforces security constraints. However, paragraph [0026] does not disclose persistence properties, either generally or with reference to the particular persistence properties recited in claim 1. In addition, based on Applicant's review of the specification of Hurmiz et al., it is not seen where persistence properties are disclosed at all in Hurmiz et al., either generally or with reference to particular persistence properties.

Applicant has considered the response to Applicant's arguments filed March 4, 2008, and while Applicant respectfully disagrees with the premise that “[t]he term 'model' is extremely broad [and] could be equated to a representation of an action,” such as a save or a cancel button, Applicant has nevertheless amended the independent claims to refer to a persistence “property of the linked source object” rather than a persistence “model.” This phrasing is consistent with the Specification and refers to a property of the linked dimension and/or measure group object (see paragraph [0021] of the Specification) and could not refer to a representation of an action.

Moreover, claim 1 has been amended to recite additional limitations, including “the refresh policy comprising one of refreshing the information in the target datastore with every query to the linked source object and refreshing the information in the target database at specified time intervals” and “processing a query to the linked source object by forwarding the query to the object in the source datastore, receiving a response to the query, caching the response in a memory, and registering the response in a registry.” Applicant respectfully submits that Hurmiz et al. also fails to disclose these newly added limitations. While Le is cited as allegedly disclosing the limitations of claims 7-8 and 18, Le does not appear to disclose the other limitations of claim 1, such as linking an object in a source datastore to an object in a target datastore or specifying a persistence property for controlling how changes to the linked source object are handled by the target datastore.

For at least these reasons and the reasons set forth in the amendment filed March 4, 2008, Hurmiz et al. fails to disclose all of the limitations of claim 1 and therefore does not anticipate claim 1. Claims 2 and 9-10 depend from claim 1 and are also not anticipated by Hurmiz et al. at least by reason of this dependency.

Claims 13 and 22 have been amended to recite similar limitations to those recited in claim 1 as amended above. In addition, claim 13, as amended, recites that “caching the response is managed using a least recently used (LRU) scheme,” a limitation that is not disclosed in any of the cited references. Accordingly, claims 13 and 22 are also not anticipated by Hurmiz et al.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-2, 9-10, 13, and 22 are patentable over the prior art of record, and requests reconsideration and removal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 102.

Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 3-4, 7-8, 11-12, 14-18, 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2005/0076036 (“Le”). Claims 7-8 and 18 are cancelled in this paper.

As per claims 3-4 and 21, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Hurmiz et al. discloses all of the recited limitations, except for the source and target datastores being OLAP databases. As per claims 11-12 and 14-17, the rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Hurmiz et al. discloses all of the recited limitations, except for the linked source object being a dimension or a measure group. Le is cited as allegedly teaching these limitations.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Even assuming Le discloses the particular limitations recited in claims 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, and 21, Applicant respectfully submits that Le fails to disclose the remaining limitations of claims 1 and 13 that are not disclosed in Hurmiz et al., including, for example, “processing a query to the linked source object by forwarding the query to the object in the source datastore, receiving a response to the query, caching the response in a memory, and registering the response in a registry.” Thus, claims 3-4, 11-12, 14-17, and 21 are patentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of Le at least by reason of their dependency from claims 1 and 13.

Claim 20 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,477,536 (“Pasumansky et al.”). The rejection is understood to be based on the premise that Hurmiz et al. discloses all of the recited limitations, except for the source and target datastores residing on two computers. Pasumansky et al. is cited as disclosing this limitation.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. Even assuming Pasumansky et al. discloses the particular limitation recited in claim 20, Applicant respectfully submits that Pasumansky et al. fails to disclose the remaining limitations of claim 13 that are not disclosed in Hurmiz et al., including, for example, “processing a query to the linked source object by forwarding the query to the object in the source datastore, receiving a response to the query, caching the response in a memory, and registering the response in a registry.” Thus, claim 20

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863
Application No.: 10/750,205
Office Action Dated: May 28, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

is patentable over Hurmiz et al. in view of Pasumansky et al. at least by reason of its dependency from claim 13.

Based at least on the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the currently pending claims are patentable over the prior art of record, and requests reconsideration and removal of the outstanding rejections under 35 U.S.C. § 103.

DOCKET NO.: 306352.01 / MSFT-2863
Application No.: 10/750,205
Office Action Dated: May 28, 2008

PATENT
REPLY FILED UNDER EXPEDITED
PROCEDURE PURSUANT TO
37 CFR § 1.116

CONCLUSION

In view of the above amendments and remarks, Applicant respectfully submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested.

Date: November 26, 2008

/Kenneth R. Eiferman/

Kenneth R. Eiferman
Registration No. 51,647

Woodcock Washburn LLP
Cira Centre
2929 Arch Street, 12th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19104-2891
Telephone: (215) 568-3100
Facsimile: (215) 568-3439